

REMARKS

Claims 16, 18 and 20-31 are now pending in the application. Claim 25 has been allowed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 20-24 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner's attention is directed to Claims 22, 23 and 31 which have been amended to overcome the rejections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Bakhsh et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,527,296). Claims 16, 18, 20-24 and 26-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nushor (U.S. 2002/0005635).

With respect to the rejection of Claim 16, the Examiner's attention is directed to independent Claim 16 which has been amended to include the limitation that the restrictions are generally perpendicular to the bottom edge and further define an inflatable portion (162) which has generally parallel sides. Claim 16 has further been amended to clarify that the first and second set of restrictions are non-overlapping within the air bag. Applicant submits that the references do not teach or suggest these limitations.

The Examiner's attention is directed to independent Claim 26. Claim 26 has been amended to clarify that the second restrictions extend generally perpendicular to and vertically up from a portion of the periphery to form an inflatable portion 162 there between. Claim 26 has additionally been amended to include the limitation that the restrictions are generally misaligned horizontally and non-overlapping vertically. Applicant submits that neither of cited references teach these limitations.

Similarly, Claim 31 has been amended to clarify that the air bag has a generally parallel first set of restrictions which form an inflatable portion 162 with generally parallel sides. Further, as the first and second set of restrictions define the top and bottom edges of the middle region, they do not overlap.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov 22 - 2006

By: 
Markell Seitzman, Reg. No. 28,756
Christopher A. Eusebi, Reg. No. 44,672

(586) 72603905
(586) 726-4172 (fax)

CAE/smb